

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-14 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended herein. Claims 2 and 9 have been canceled. Favorable reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

I. CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Claims 1 and 8 have been amended to emphasize with more particularity the features originally set forth in claims 2 and 9.

For example, claim 1 now defines a remote control system for carrying out remote control setting processing and remote control operation processing. The system includes a receiver receiving a signal from a remote controller and decoding the signal to a remote code during the remote control setting processing and the remote control operation processing. In addition, the system includes a register firstly registering a selected operation of a program corresponding to the remote code obtained by the receiver in a registration table and secondly registering another selected operation of a program corresponding to the obtained remote code in the registration table during the remote control setting processing. A determiner is provided that determines whether or not the remote code obtained by the receiver has been registered in the registration table during the remote control operation processing. Furthermore, an executor executing the operation of the program corresponding to the obtained remote code when the determiner determines the obtained remote code has been registered in the registration table.

Claim 8 has been amended in a similar manner.

Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 8 is found, for example, in the present application at page 10, line 10 to page 11, line 11, as originally filed.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-5 AND 8-12 UNDER 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1-5 and 8-12 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on *Cha* in view of newly cited *Huang*. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 1 and 8, as amended, recite how the register registers each operation of a program corresponding to the same remote code at different times. Specifically, the register firstly registers a selected operation of a program corresponding to the remote code and secondly registers another selected operation of a program corresponding to the remote code that has been already registered. As such, the register in the system of the present invention can register a plurality of operations to a same remote code at different times and which do not necessarily relate to each other.

Cha and *Huang* both fail to teach or suggest a register firstly registering a selected operation of a program corresponding to the remote code obtained by the receiver in a registration table and secondly registering another selected operation of a program corresponding to the obtained remote code in the registration table during the remote control processing as recited in amended claims 1 and 8.

In rejecting claim 2 based on *Cha* and *Huang* alone, the Examiner refers to the tables in Figs. 6 and 7 of *Cha* as including plural programs. However, no where does *Cha* teach or suggest the register registers each operation of a program corresponding to the same remote code at different times as recited in amended claims 1 and 8.

Because both *Cha* and *Huang* fail to teach or suggest the features of amended claims 1 and 8, applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 2, 4-7, 9 AND 11-14 UNDER 35 USC §103(a)

Further, claims 2, 4-7, 9 and 11-14 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on *Cha* and *Huang*, and further in view of *Wugoski*. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 2, 4-7, 9 and 11-14 each depend from claim 1 or claim 8, either directly or indirectly. As a result, these claims may be distinguished over *Cha* and *Huang* for at least the same reasons discussed above.

Wugoski does not make up for the above-discussed deficiencies in *Cha*. In rejecting original claims 2 and 9, the Examiner relies on *Wugoski* as teaching assigning a macro sequence of command to a single remote control button. (See, e.g., O.A., p. 4, citing Col. 7 of *Wugoski*). Applicants respectfully submit, however, that *Wugoski* does not teach or suggest the features of amended claims 1 and 8.

More specifically, in *Wugoski* the system 100/200 defines a selected sequence of commands as a macro and assigns the macro to a single remote control button. The system 100/200 assigns a sequence of commands to a single remote control button at one time. (See, e.g., Fig. 5 of *Wugoski*). The user must select or generate a mixed sequence of events or commands so as to define a macro (step 502). Thereafter, the user selects a hard key and the system, at one time, assigns the macro sequence to the hard key (step 506 & 512).

Accordingly, *Wugoski* does not make up for the deficiencies in *Cha* and *Huang*. None of the references, whether taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest a register registering each operation of a program corresponding to the same remote code at different times as recited in amended claims 1 and 8.

Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

IV. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, all claims 1, 3-8 and 10-14 are believed to be allowable and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Should a petition for an extension of time be necessary for the timely reply to the outstanding Office Action (or if such a petition has been made and an additional extension is necessary), petition is hereby made and the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees (including additional claim fees) to Deposit Account No. 18-0988.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

/Mark D. Saralino/
Mark D. Saralino
Reg. No. 34,243

DATE: November 9, 2006

The Keith Building
1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113

intlp100amendmentafterfinal2.wpd